R Hib. 8. 681. 6.

A DISSUASIVE From POPERY

Michael Jephson

Sent in a

LETTER

From A. B. to C. D.

DUBLN.
Printed by *Benjamin Took* and *John Crook* Printers to the King's Most Excellent Majesty; and are to be sold by *Mary Crook* & *Andrew Crook* at his Majesties Printing-house in *Skinner-Row*. 1681.

10..,224

A. Sutton
15 Dec. '09

Honoured Sir,

THe laſt time we were together, you told me, that a friend of yours long'd to ſee in a paper under my hand the reaſons of my unkindneſs to Popery. To which he (or you for him) obligingly added, that I did not appear unkind to the perſons of Papiſts, and that indifferency in judging is there likelyeſt to be found, where Bitternes of humour is not prevalent.

Now Sir though I know and very much honour you, yet I am not acquainted with your friend, and am ſenſible that uſe may be made of ſuch a paper to my diſadvantage. However I here ſend it you; for I do really look upon Proteſtancy (That of the Church of England) to be ſo high a Bleſſing both to the particular profeſſors of it, and to the Country where it is embrac'd, that I could, adventure very far in whatſoever ſhould promiſe the advancement of it.

The paper may be ſhewn as you or your friend ſhall think fit; but I would not have it publiſhed in Print; tis not ſtudied enough for that.

I Reduce my dislikes of Popery to two Heads, the incredibienes of its Doctrins, and the grievousnes of the Yoke imposed on its Professors. Of its incrdible Doctrins. I name first *Transubstantiation.*

In the way of Nature this is not so properly called incredible, as absurd and impossible; It makes the Body of Christ to be in a Thousand places at once. It makes that Body wear its own quantity under the dimensions of a Wafer, *that is*, to have its own bigness but to be never the bigger for it. It makes the accidents of Bread and Wine Exist without a subject; *that is*, there is whiteness and there is moisture, but there is nothing Either white or moist, It makes the accidents of Bread and Wine to nourish the Eaters and Drinkers of them, *that is*, to be turned into Substances. *&c.* To all which it is answerd *that Gods pow-*

er is ſufficient to overcome all theſe Difficulties, Neither will I diſpute his Power where his Will is revealed. But I ſay it is incredible that Tranſubſtantiation in the Euchariſt ſhould be the will of God. For All other Miracles recorded in the Holy Scriptures ſerv'd to ſome End. Elias called fire from Heaven, *to make it appear that the Lord is God, and that he was his ſervant* So Chriſt raiſed up the widow's ſon, *for the comfort of the widow, and for the manifeſtation of his own Power.* But Tranſubſtantiation ſerves to no End that has been yet nam'd; It convinces no body, it profits no body. Our Saviour ſays ſo, Jo: 6. *the fleſh profits not.* That is, by being bodily Eaten. Chriſts fleſh profits by being taken into God; by ſuffering upon the Croſs, by being believed on; but by being bodily Eaten, it has no effect either upon the body; or the Soul of the eater. Not upon the body, for that they confeſs is concern'd only in the accidents of the bread and wine departed. Nor upon the Soul, for that feeds on Chriſt only Spiritually,

viz.

viz. by Faith, Hope and Charity. Now is it credible that God would worke ſo many miracles as are in the bowells of *Tranſubſtantiation*, for no end in the World?

2ly, The courſe of nature is certainly the will of God; therefore we muſt not believe it is inverted, but where God himſelf declares it is ſo. Here they ſay God has declar'd for Tranſubſtantiation in theſe words: *This is my body* &c. I anſwer, no more then in theſe: *that rock was Chriſt.* Or then in theſe of the ſame Apoſtle: *We are all one bread.* For all three ſentences are equally poſitive, and are equally the word of God. Now, was the rock which followed the Iſraelites in the wilderneſs turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſt not then born? Or are all Chriſtians turned ſubſtantially into bread? No, all ſay, *that rock was Chriſt* imports no more then *that rock was the repreſentative of Chriſt. We are all one bread*; that is, *we are all repreſented by one bread*; why not then, *this is my body*, that is, *this is the repreſentative of my body*? If it be lawful to take one word

of God figuratively, it cannot be wicked to take another so, if the matter equally requires. And certainly there can be no greater necessity any where, than in the Eucharist of flying from Transubstantiation to a figure.

3ly. tis Incredible that the Apostles or the Primitive Church ever thought of Transubstantiation; When our Saviour said *I go to the Father*, the Disciples asked what it was. When he told the *Parable of the Sower*, they asked what it meant, If they had thought of a change of substance by the words of Consecration, would they not have said: *how can this be?* do we not see there as formerly? and the bread and wine as formerly? But he had instructed them Jo. 6. how *his flesh* is *meat indeed and his blood drink indeed*, to wit Spiritually not bodily, therefore they boggl'd not.

Again, not one Apostle nor one Christian Doctor for above six hundred years after Christ either mentions this change of substances, or (in all those vast volumnes) says one word that infers it. The Christi-

ans-

ans ſpoke not of it; neither did the Jews or heathens object it; Yet Tranſubſtantiation in the eye of an unbeliever is a maſſe of contradictions.

What work would *Lucian* have made with it? But no ſuch matter is mentioned by that ſcoffer, or by *Porphyry*, or *Feſtus*, or *Julian* the Apoſtate *&c.* In ſo incredible a doctrine would *Beringarius* (above a thouſand years after Chriſt) have been the firſt Heritique? If Tranſubſtantiation had been the ſetl'd doctrine of the Church in the days of *Charlemaigne*, would that Emperour have writ to *Bertram* the Prieſt for his opinion of the real Preſence? Would *Bertram* have poſitively anſwered that *the hoſt is not the ſame body of Chriſt which was born of the Virgin* Mary? Only that body of Chriſt which was born of the Virgin *Mary* is to be ador'd, therefore the adoration of the hoſt was not in faſhion in *Bertrams* days.

4ly. As there is nothing in the Holy Scripture or ancient Fathers which can be rationally brought in favour of Tranſubſtan-

ſtantiation, ſo there are in them very many ſayings which ſeem incompatible with it. Mat: 26. *Me yee have not always.* Which was ſpoken becauſe of his Death and Aſcenſion. Hear St. Auſtin upon it. *Non ſemper* &c. *Not always according to his bodily preſence, but as to his Majeſty, as to his Providence, as to his inviſible Grace is fulfilled that: Behold I am with you to the end of the World.* So Act. 3. 31. *Whom the Heavens muſt contain till the reſtitution of all things.* *Yes*, ſay they, *he is only in Heaven locally, and in the Hoſt but ſacramentally and not as in a place; his whole body being in the leaſt part of the Hoſt if ſeparate from the other parts.* Which to St. Auſtin I am ſure would have imported that Chriſt is really in Heaven and not really in the Sacrament; for he ſays upon Pſalm. 33. *Si ſpatia* &c. *If ſpace of place be taken from a body it is no where, that is, it is not.* Does this ſound as if he underſtood the quillets of Tranſubſtantiation? Again to *Boniface* ep. 25. *Si Sacramenta* &c. *If Sacraments had not the likeneſs of the things whereof they*

they are Sacraments, they would not be ſacraments; and becauſe of this likeneſs they often take the names of the things themſelves; As therefore the Sacrament of the body of Chriſt is in ſome ſort the body of Chriſt, and the Sacrament of the blood of Chriſt, is the blood of Chriſt, ſo the Sacrament of faith is faith. And againſt Adimantus *the* Manichee: *Non dubitavit* &c. *he doubted not to ſay: this is my body when he gave the ſign of his body.* And upon Pſal, 3. *mira eſt patientia* &c. *Wonderful is the patience of Chriſt who entertained* Judas *at that banquet wherein he gave his diſciples the figure of his body and his blood.* And *St.* Ambroſe de Sacramentis: *Non iſte panis* &c. *not that bread which goes down into the belly, but the bread of Eternal life which ſupports the ſoul.* Many ſuch other ſayings the Reader may find cited by old *Bertram* and of late by all the Proteſtant writers; but not a word like them is in any Roman Catholique authour ſince the Council of *Lateran.* The ſtile of the Doctours is not altered for nothing. And ſo much for Tranſubſtantiation.

Secon-

ſtantiation, ſo there are in them very many ſayings which ſeem incompatible with it. Mat: 26. *Me yee have not always.* Which was ſpoken becauſe of his Death and Aſcenſion. Hear St. Auſtin upon it. *Non ſemper* &c. *Not always according to his bodily preſence, but as to his Majeſty, as to his Providence, as to his inviſible Grace is fulfilled that: Behold I am with you to the end of the World.* So Act. 3. 31. *Whom the Heavens muſt contain till the reſtitution of all things. Yes,* ſay they, *he is only in Heaven locally, and in the Hoſt but ſacramentally and not as in a place; his whole body being in the leaſt part of the Hoſt if ſeparate from the other parts.* Which to St. Auſtin I am ſure would have imported that Chriſt is really in Heaven and not really in the Sacrament; for he ſays upon Pſalm. 33. *Si ſpatia* &c. *If ſpace of place be taken from a body it is no where, that is, it is not.* Does this ſound as if he underſtood the quillets of Tranſubſtantiation? Again to *Boniface* ep. 25. *Si Sacramenta* &c. *If Sacraments had not the likeneſs of the things whereof they*

they are Sacraments, they would not be ſacraments; and becauſe of this likeneſs they often take the names of the things themſelves; As therefore the Sacrament of the body of Chriſt is in ſome ſort the body of Chriſt, and the Sacrament of the blood of Chriſt, is the blood of Chriſt, ſo the Sacrament of faith is faith. And againſt Adimantus *the* Manichee: *Non dubitavit* &c. *he doubted not to ſay: this is my body when he gave the ſign of his body.* And upon Pſal, 3. *mira eſt patientia* &c. *Wonderful is the patience of Chriſt who entertained* Judas *at that banquet wherein he gave his diſciples the figure of his body and his blood.* And *St.* Ambroſe de Sacramentis: *Non iſte panis* &c. *not that bread which goes down into the belly, but the bread of Eternal life which ſupports the ſoul.* Many ſuch other ſayings the Reader may find cited by old *Bertram* and of late by all the Proteſtant writers; but not a word like them is in any Roman Catholique authour ſince the Council of *Lateran.* The ſtile of the Doctours is not altered for nothing. And ſo much for Tranſubſtantiation.

Secon-

Secondly, I name Purgatory for an incredible doctrin, Purgatory as maintained in the Church of Rome is a priſon at the edge of hell, where ſouls are deteined till by ſuffering they ſatisfy for ſuch venial ſins as they dyed under, or for mortal ſins for which they had not perfectly done their pennance. The pains differ from hell fire only in being Temporary; and the ſouls which ſuffer them are in high Charity, and at the laſt gaſp were purg'd from all unfiting affections; yet muſt they ly here and fry for their paſt treſpaſſes, till the utmoſt farthing be pay'd. And all their own charity avails nothing towards their deliverance, but they are ordinarily ranſom'd from long durance by the Charity of their friends on earth layd out upon Maſſes, Pilgrimages &c. And upon ſome occaſions whole ſholes are let out by the Popes Indulgence.

Now I ſay this is an incredible doctrine in it ſelf, for, 1. the Chriſtian faith is that Chriſt ſatisfied for the ſins of the World, how then can ſouls ſuffer meerly for the ſa-

ſatisfaction of the Divine Juſtice? Puniſhments in this World are our corrections, but puniſhing when there can be no amendment muſt be a meer wrecking of vengeance, tis ſo in hell, and they ſay it is ſo in Purgatory. 2. tis incredible that God ſhould ſo horribly afflict thoſe Souls which ſo entirely love him, and which he ſo highly loves. 3, Tis incredible that venial ſins which upon earth are purg'd with an Ave, a Pater noſter, a thump on the breſt, or ſprinkling of a little holy water ſhould after death merit ſuch horrible torments, and which for ought I can hear may laſt many years. 4. If theſe ſins do merit the great pains of Purgatory, then 'tis incredible that a Maſſe, or a pilgrimage ſhould pay the debt. 5. If Purgatory be a neceſſary and alſo an aſſured paſſage into heaven, tis incredible that any fire there can be a torment; for the way to bliſſe is happy, In this world hope of ſalvation made Martyrs endure tortures with patience, but that torture which brings with it aſſurance is matter of triumph. 6. 'Tis

in-

incredible that ſouls ſhould be ſenſible of bodily fire: who can imagin what a ſcorch'd Soul is? or how fire can torment the underſtanding or the Wil? And the ſeperated ſoul has nothing in it beſides them two. But to all this I am anſwered as I was about Tranſubſtantiation, that God's power is incomprehenſible, and his ways paſt finding out. However, I ſay Purgatory being ſo Irrational in it ſelf has need to be well pro'vd from abroad; I mean by Texts of Scripture, and Expoſitions of ancient Fathers: But there is not one Text in the whole Bible applyed to this Purgatory till after *S. Auſtin.* Nay tis impoſſible that many of the Ancient Fathers ſhould hold Purgatory as it is now held in the Church of Rome; for they held that no Souls (at leaſt very few of the moſt perfect) go to Heaven till the day of Judgment; and that in the interim they are kept in receptacles without any pain but that of delay'd Happineſs; and that at the day of Judgement they muſt all paſs through fire; Origen: in *Pſalm:* 36. *Ut ego arbitror* &c. *As I think*

it

it is neceſſary for us all to come to that fire: though one be a Paul *or a* Peter; *Such a one indeed ſhall be told: though thou goeſt through the flame it ſhall not burn thee; But a ſinner like me ſhall come to that fire like* Peter *or* Paul, *but ſhall not go through it like them.* Ambroſ: in coment: Pſalterji: *Igne nos* &c. David *ſays: thou haſt tryed us by fire, therefore we ſhall all be tryed by fire: and if we be not conſum'd yet we ſhall be ſcorch'd.* Lactant: 7 jnſtit C. 1. *Sed & juſtos &c. When God Judgeth even the juſt, he will examin them with fire, then they whoſe ſins are great either in weight or number ſhall be vehemently ſcorched: the ripe in virtue ſhall not feel that fire.* Hieronym: tomo 3. in Amos: *Vocatus ignis &c. The fire call'd to Judgment, firſt devours the Abyſs, that is, all the kind's of ſins, Wood, Hay, Stubble.* Aug: in 15. Gen. *Ad ſolis &c. At the ſetting of the Sun, that is, at the End, By that fire is ſignified the day of Judgment, ſeparating thoſe carnalls who are to be ſav'd by fire, from thoſe who are to be damn'd in the fire.* And in Pſal. 6.

Talem

Talem me &c. Render me such now as shall not need amendment by fire. And 20 de civ: Dei: *Out of what has been said it seems evident that in the judgment some will suffer some purging pains.*

I take this labour to clear the Purgatory held by some of the ancient, because their sayings and the Texts which they cite for their Purgatory are all which they bring now for the Purgatory maintain'd in the Church of Rome; whereas tis impossible that they who held the former Purgatory should hold this latter, for, 1. the former Purgatory was in the judgment, this Latter is immediatly after Death. 2. The former Purgatory was for the amendment of the person, this latter punishes for *Sin* when the person is perfect. 3. The former Purgatory afflicted the person till he had pay'd the utermost farthing, that is, till all his disorderly affections were worn off; this latter clears a man out of prison for the good deeds of others upon Earth *viz.* Prayer, Pilgrimages, Masses, Indulgences &c. and without this Appendix of Indulgences the Pop

Pope would not lift up a Finger for *Purgatory*. In fine, he that in the Church of *Rome* holds no other *Purgatory* but that which the fore-quoted Fathers held, will be declar'd hæretical, of which *Tho: White* late an *English Priest* of the Church of *Rome* is an example. See his book *de medio animarum Statu*.

But it may be ſaid: The ancient Fathers holding one ſort of Purgatory, and the preſent Church of *Rome* holding another ſort, how come we Proteſtants to hold none? I anſwer: The Church of *Rome* is to account for throwing off the Purgatory maintained by ſome of the Fathers; for ſhe had thrown it off long before our Reformation; We indeed threw off that Purgatory which is maintained by the preſent Church of Rome, as new and invented; which is thus demonſtrated out of the foregoing diſcourſe. The preſent Church of Rome maintains a Purgatory abſolutely inconſiſtent with that which was maintained by the ancient Fathers (as is proved above); therefore the Purgatory of the preſent Church of Rome came not by tra-

dition from the Fathers, but was invented by their children.

Add to this St. Austin ad Dulcitium q. 1. *It is not incredible*, says he, *that such a thing should be after this life, and inquiry may be made whether it be so, and it may be found out, and it may be hid, that some of the faithful through a certain Purgatory fire should be sav'd sooner or later as they did more or less love the good things that perish.* He says *Purgatory is not incredible* (that is, some sort of Purgatory) *that it may be inquir'd after, and perhaps it may be found, and perhaps not.* A good while after him *Gregory* said to *Peter* the Deacon, that many things are now known of separate souls which were not known of old.

And *Bede* says that Purgatory became known in *England* upon the miraculous deliverance of a souldier from his bonds by the sacrifice of the Masse. In fine, the Greek Church never own'd Purgatory, and yet to them (as to gospel matters) was *declared the whole council of God.* Act. 20. 27.

But suppose Transubstantiation and Purga-

gatory are fictions, is the Errour Damnable? I do not say whether it be or no; but I am sure that all errour is dangerous to the soul, because it is its blindness; and if the blind lead the blind &c. Besides, errour has a spawn of consequents in which the blackness is often more sensible than in the *damm.* For instance, the opinion of Transubstantiation has (though not by good consequence to my reason) brought forth a sacrilegious detention of the Cup from the Laity. Adoration of the Host is another and a true birth of the same opinion; and that has in it many symptomes of Idolatry. *But what soul-killing venom comes from Purgatory?* Why, tis a grosse disparagment of the passion of Christ which we do accuse of imperfection, while we think it necessary to joyn our own sufferings with it for the satisfaction of the divine Justice.

I have done with Transubstantiation and Purgatory, and need not name any more of the incredible doctrins of Popery; for this is one of their doctrins, that he who denies one Article of the Faith, denies

all; becauſe the propoſal of the Church is the only reaſon of believing any. Out of which I infer; that if they are baffl'd in any one Article; they are undone as to all; for their propoſal has loſt its infallibility. Therefore in the next place, as the doctrins of Popery are incredible and dangerous to our condition in the world to come, ſo I ſay the yoke of it is very grievous and the burthen almoſt inſupportable, in this world. For,

Firſt, Popery deprives us of ſeveral rights of nature. It requires us to believe things naturally abſurd, without giving us any ſupernatural proof, as appears in the inſtances of Tranſubſtantiation and Purgatory; and yet if we doubt, we are damn'd to the fire of this world, and that of the world to come. Agen, to make us pray and praiſe God in an unknown tongue; What is it but to rob us of the common rights of humanity: Parrots and Pies learn words, but to underſtand them is the priviledge of mankind. And he that ſhould worſhip God only by ſaying what he does

not

not understand, were degenerate into a beast as to his religion. St. Paul says *if in the Church they all speak with tongues*, (though themselves do understand them) *that a stranger coming in, will think them mad.* Is it not madder for them all to speak with tongues which they do not understand? That Papist must be very much stupifyed to whom this imposition is not grievous.

2dly. Popery is a great Invader of our Civil Rights. The Pope can excommunicate a King; and by so doing, his Subjects are absolv'd from their Oath of fidelity, and are commanded to pay no Obedience; so the Prince loses his government, and the people not only, lose their Protection but also are Embarras'd in insoluble doubts of conscience, between the pretensions of the Pope and those of the King. And this was the Popish Doctrin long before the *Jesuits*, as appears in *Thomas Aquinas*'s Summ. Neither has the Pope ever been drawn to declare against that Branch of his power; though in several Provinces he might by

ſuch a declaration have delivered abundance of his people from very great troubles. Nay the Pope diſpoſes of unforfeited Kingdoms. He gave away the Kingdoms of *Mexico* and *Peru*; though thoſe Kings had never been under his Juriſdiction, and S. Paul ſays; *what have we to do with them that are without?* But there is an inſtance of this grievance about which I am more concern'd. Our King *John* had troubles from his Subjects to that height, that he was fain to reſign up his Crown to the Pope, and to receive it again from *Pandolf* his Legate, and to hold it thenceforth as from the Pope. This they ſay and brag off, and upon this accompt pretend a Title to *England* at this day. Here are ſeveral matters hard to be underſtood. If the Pope was partner in the Rebellion, what can be more dangerous than he to Soveraignty? If he was no partner in the Rebellion, how came he to get the Crown by the Succeſs of the Rebells? Again, if *John* was Perſecuted as an Uſurper, why was not the Crown given

given to the right Heir? But nothing can be more unpolitick than their pretending a Title to *England* from this Tranſaction with King *John*; for it intitles them to the juſt Indignation of every King of *England* and of all his good Subjects.

Thirdly, Popery is very grievous to the private purſe &c. conſequently dwarfs any people that embraces it. Of what boundles numbers are their Clergy and Religious? *The preſent ſtate of France* ſays that one third of that Kingdom is theirs; and it muſt be worſe in *Spain*. Then, their Pilgrimages, Ranſomes from Purgatory, Offrings at ſhrines and Diviſications are notable Pick-pockets. *But how do diviſications work?* Why the people look upon a new Saint as a new Adovcate for them in Heaven.

But here it may be ſaid, that ſome of our people think the Proteſtant Clergy (Eſpecially of the Church of *England*) pretty chargeable. I anſwer, that the means of our Clergy is ſo ſmall a pittance in compariſon of that which went away with

Popery, that they must be very unreasonable who grutch it. And really I never knew any maligne the decent maintenance of our Church but such as discovered a great many other vices. In our late confusions, all that were against the Church were against God and the King and their fellow Subjects: they were shamefully prophane, and yet Hypocrites in contempt of all our senses. But this is a digression. The truth is, Religion must be in some degree Chargeable: for if we will serve God only out of that which costs us nothing; then in our Eye the service of God is nothing worth. But there may be too much taken as well as there may be too little given.

I might add other grievances: as the horrible imposing on the vulgar by miracles; to which no man of reason among themselves gives any credit. Then how restles are their Bigotts in Plotts! But they are told of that by Enough. We had here a Barbarous Rebellion in the year 1641. I do not know whither the Pope

rais'd

rais'd it or no; but he own'd it, and encou-rag'd it, and hindred all expedients offer'd for a cloſure of the Wound, to the un-doing of very many Gentlemen of that party, who yet are ſo well natur'd as to love his *Holineſs* never the leſs. Nay of late Fanaticiſme thrives by Popery. The Presbyterians ſay the Indulgence to them and others was but to cover that to the Papiſts; But I never believe it the ſooner for their ſaying it. No I think the Papiſts help'd the Fanatiques only by *Antiperiſtaſis*. The late Plot makes them look ſo black, that the Ignorant people run to thoſe Religions which pretend to greateſt diſtance from Popery.

I would now draw to a concluſion, but that I find my work is not don againſt Popery till I cleare Proteſtancy from ſome dirt thrown on it, which I ſhall endeavour to do as briefly as I have don the reſt.

Ob: 1. *Proteſtants generally yield that a Papiſt may be ſav'd, how then came Reformation from Popery to be neceſſary? why ſhould the unity of the Church be broken for*

for That without which we may be Eternally happy? I anſwer, we condemne no man; there is one that will Judge the world, and charity commands us to hope that well meaning Papiſts will be ſav'd in that day. But if any man thinks the Popiſh doctrines falſe, and yet profeſſes them as Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, his Hypocriſy is a damnable ſin. Hence the Reformation became neceſſary. God open'd the Eyes of ſeveral people: They ſaw errours in the Church, refus'd to own them, declar'd againſt them; and in ſome Countries prevail'd againſt them. They muſt either do ſo, or be Hypocrites in profeſſing what they did not think. Not that men are every where bound to proclaim their Religion, but in the Church of Rome they are. There they muſt profeſs every thing with the Church, or ſuffer as Hereticks. In Summe, the Church of Rome kept the Chriſtian Faith, therefore we did not, neither might we leave it becauſe of ſome erronious ſuperſtructions; not, for example ſake, becauſe they be-

believed Tranſubſtantiation and ador'd the hoſt; but becauſe they compelled us to believe and to do ſo.

Ob 2. *If it be lawfull for Proteſtants to reform from Popery for conſcience ſake; then it is lawfull upon the ſame account for Preſbyterians to reform from Proteſtants, and for Independents, and for Anabaptiſts, Quakers &c. without end. And if this be allowed, in what a perpetual toſs of troubles will Chriſtian Countries be? One crying up one way to Heaven, and another crying up another way, and their words often proceeding to blows, each one party condemning all the reſt: but moſt of them joyning againſt the* Chief Magiſtrate? Beſides the unity of the Church is gone, the Communion of Saints is gone, and the Church will ſoon be gone; for diviſion is not many ſteps before deſtruction.

This objection goes a great way with many people, therefore I will ſet down my anſwer diſtinctly in branches.

1. I confeſs that diviſions in the Church do naturally tend to the deſtruction of it; but

but of this Evil they only are guilty who cauſe the diviſion. Now who caus'd our departure from the Church of Rome, we that were driven, or they who drove us away? If it be ſaid: *who drove you away?* I anſwer: They that made it mortal for us to ſtay. We muſt either hear our Conſcience, or them, or the Word.

2dly. Every man is bound to reform himſelf according to his conſcience, *that is*, he is bound not to profeſs that which he does not believe, and not to do that which he thinks is unlawfull. But though every mans reaſon be his own guide; yet no one mans reaſon is the guide of other men (unleſs they make it ſo as in the caſe of Magiſtracy &c.) therefore no particular perſon ought to preſs the Reformation of other men, unles he be authoriſed by God or man. Yet it is poſſible, that private perſons may think themſelves bound in conſcience not only to reform themſelves but others alſo; to Preach and perhaps fight up their own way. And when this frenzy is prevalent, tis a great

iudg-

judgment from God both upon the persons poſſeſſ'd with it, and upon the Nation in which it happens. But the rule is, that as they follow their own erronious conſcience in theſe pranks; ſo the chief Magiſtrate is to follow his conſcience, which is not to ſuffer them to do hurt to the Church or State.

3ly. I confeſs that our being ſubject to troubles from Presbyterians &c. is an imbecility in our Church; but tis common to us with the Church of Rome; We are vexed with Sectaries, and they are vex'd with the ſame Sectaries, and with us too.

4ly. But I ſhal be told that the ſtrength of the Objection is in this, That by our Reformation from Popery We gave a Precedent inviting others to Reform from Us; To this I ſay, that in our Reformation the King and People were of a mind and Reform'd according to order of Law; therefore Our Reſormation is no Precedent for the tumultous, and violent Endeavours of Presbyterians &c. Again, the Sectaries have not the ſame neceſſity of Seperating from us as we had

had for Separation from Rome; for we could not ſtay there without declaring for *Tranſubſtantiation* &c. which we could not believe; but the Presbyterians, Anabaptiſts &c. may hold their own Opinions in our Church without ever being enquir'd into about it, nay if they are known to be of ſuch Opinions, there is not the leaſt puniſhment for it. So that our Reformation was of Neceſſity, Their's of Wantonneſs. We are no Precedent for them. To conclude upon this Objection, I ſay human affairs cannot but be ſubject to inconveniences; & therefore we muſt not reject any thing for an adhering Inconvenience, unles its Oppoſite be leſs Inconvenient. Let us then conſider whether poſſible Troubles from Sectaries, or the certain Intolerablenes of the Roman Yoke upon our Conſciences, Lives, and Fortunes be the greater Inconvenience.

Ob. 3. At leaſt the Romiſh Religion, by the power it has upon peoples Conſciences ſeems apter than the Proteſtant to keep the people in Obedience to a Catholick Prince, and ſo ought to be cheriſh'd by ſuch Prin-

Princes. I anſwer: Popery is not ſo good at keeping Subjects quiet as it is at raiſing tumults; witnes the French League againſt a Roman Catholick King. Yes, Popery has made many Rebellions where no intereſt was concern'd but its own: but where did it ever hinder a Rebellion to which other intereſts invited? Did it hinder the Barons Wars in *England*? Did it hinder the Rebellion of almoſt all *Spain* againſt *Charles* the firſt? Did it hinder *Maſſanello* in *Naples*? Did it hinder the *Suiſſ-cantons* from revolting from the houſe of *Auſtria*? Papiſts have often Rebell'd, But we can ſay of the Proteſtants (I mean the Church of *England*) that they have never yet rebell'd, & that if ever they would Rebell; they would have done it in the late times, when their Loyalty contended with all the miſeries of an unſucceſsful War, of long penury, of Captivity, of baniſhment, of ſhameful Deaths. But they bore all theſe; and alſo deſpiſ'd *Cromwells* many flattering invitations. Whereas the Papiſts of England were then ſaid to offer

offer in purchaſe of their Liberty *an Abjuration of the Royal Line and a Submiſſion to the Line of that Uſurper.* I am not abſolutely ſure of this laſt; but I am perfectly ſure, that in thoſe dayes Mr. *White* a Romiſh Prieſt of *England*, publiſhed a book (Dedicated to Sr. *Kenelm Digby*) entitl'd *Of Government and Obedience*; wherein he pretends to prove that *God Himſelfe is no otherwiſe Monarch of the World than by his Omnipotence, and conſequently that an Earthly King loſing his Power, loſes his Authority: and that neither ought others to raiſe troubles for the recovering of his right, nor would he, if honeſt, deſire it.* Certainly what ever Religion a King himſelf is of, he has reaſon to wiſh for Proteſtant Subjects.

FINIS.